## Exhibit F

```
1
     Daogfhfc
                            Conference
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
     -----x
 2
 3
    FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE
 3
     AGENCY,
 4
 4
                    Plaintiff,
 5
 5
                                            11-CV-6188 (DLC)
                v.
 6
                                            11-CV-6189 (DLC)
 6
                                            11-CV-6190 (DLC)
 7
                                            11-CV-6192 (DLC)
 7
                                            11-CV-6193 (DLC)
 8
                                            11-CV-6195 (DLC)
 8
                                            11-CV-6198 (DLC)
 9
                                            11-CV-6200 (DLC)
9
                                            11-CV-6201 (DLC)
10
                                            11-CV-6202 (DLC)
10
                                            11-CV-6203 (DLC)
11
                                            11-CV-6739 (DLC)
11
                                            11-CV-7010 (DLC)
12
    JPMORGAN CHASE & CO., et al.,
12
13
                    Defendants.
                                           Conference
13
14
     And other FHFA cases.
14
     -----X
15
                                            New York, N.Y.
15
                                            October 24, 2013
16
                                            3:30 p.m.
16
17
    Before:
17
                           HON. DENISE COTE,
18
18
19
                                            District Judge
19
20
                              APPEARANCES
20
21
     QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
21
          Attorneys for Plaintiff
22
    BY: MOLLY STEPHENS, ESQ.
22
          SASCHA RAND, ESQ.
23
24
25
                    SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.
```

10 Conference

we just haven't gotten a commitment that they can do it by the end of the year.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

As we set forth in our letter, your Honor, we have established why we need December 20 as the date. March 28 is the cutoff, but we need to conduct depositions between in that beginning time of 2014. So, the project files are necessary for us to identify the deposition witnesses, notice up the depositions, and complete them.

In addition, the schedules also require expert reports, rebuttal reports to be submitted to defendant's affirmative due diligence defenses beginning on February 17, 2014. And those project files which contain the actual due diligence that was done for defendants will be necessary to review, so we can actually respond to defendant's expert reports.

THE COURT: Ms. Stephens, I have no doubt that all parties in this litigation would like the files produced promptly, and even December seems very late in the day for production of these files.

But is the dispute about the date or who's going to pay for the personnel that Clayton needs in order to make a timely production?

MS. STEPHENS: I think both, your Honor. And Clayton will not commit to a date. It says that it will in good faith continue working towards responding to the subpoenas, but it SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

cannot guarantee a date. And as you saw from the letter, it's still viewing March as the final date for completion. And there is a dispute that — to actually insure completion by the December 20 date, there might need to be hiring of additional personnel. FHFA's position is that is an internal cost of doing business for complying with a subpoena and that is not something that should be passed onto FHFA.

As your Honor may recall, we did have a dispute with the rating agencies, S&P, Moody's and Fitch, about this issue, as well, back in May. And there was an issue about cost reimbursement in May where your Honor noted that responding to a subpoena is a cost of doing business, the internal cost of doing business.

In this case, Clayton has over 600 employees. It's using only one to pull project files. It has said to us that even with this one, it should be able to finish its production by the end of the year; although, as we know, the rate that we've been quoted for pulling project files at 30 files per week make us question that estimate. But we do want a guarantee of a date. And to the extent that Clayton does need to hire extra people to meet that date, we contend this is an internal cost of responding to a subpoena.

As you know, as well, under the authority of In Re: World Trade Center, there are three factors that the courts look to in determining whether to shift costs; that is, the SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

nonparties' interest in the litigation, whether the nonparty can bear the cost, and the public interest in the litigation.

As you know, the public interest of the litigation, FHFA is pursuing this on behalf of taxpayers. In terms of the cost, FHFA is pursuing this on behalf of taxpayers. Clayton, on the other hand, is a private company that can bear its internal costs of doing business. And finally, FHFA's position is also that because Clayton was essentially an agent of these defendants doing their due diligence work, the work that defendants will rely on for their affirmative defense, that it does have an interest in this litigation or at least should have been aware that the documents it has are relevant to this litigation.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Stephens.

Mr. Rothenberg, can you describe physically the task of producing this file, an individual file, due diligence file?

MR. ROTHENBERG: Yes, I'd be happy to. The due diligence reports, which are the reports that were created for

each of Clayton's clients which includes the defendants in this action, as well as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, those reports are stored electronically on various servers at Clayton. Those servers are located both in Connecticut and in Florida.

There is no one central repository for those repository for those files. So, Clayton can't simply go to an area on the server and just pull up, for example, the Deutsche SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

Bank due diligence reports. They sit in different areas of different servers. It's a manual process that requires someone who is familiar with Clayton's network, as well as familiar with due diligence itself to go into the various drives in the servers to find those reports and to cull out the reports that are actually the ones that went to the clients and to make sure that there's no duplicates being produced and that these are the actual reports being called for.

Because of the various naming conventions used within Clayton, that is not something that you can just click on a file and say, yes, that is the due diligence report that was sent to Deutsche Bank in March 2007. You have to open up those reports, look at them, and confirm that they are, indeed, the reports for that particular project.

It's a very manually intensive, labor intensive project that Clayton undertakes, both with regard to the FHFA actions and with regard to the numerous other RBS actions around the country.

When counsel refers to one person being involved in this, that's inaccurate. There is one point person who goes in and is familiar with the systems to pull these documents. Then they go through multiple different people who perform the QC function to insure that the documents being produced are the ones being called for and that Clayton hasn't missed any reports that are on its servers so that the production is SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

complete and accurate when it's called for. That process takes a while which is why Clayton cannot produce hundreds of these in a week. In doing that, your Honor -- if I can address for a few moments some of the points Ms. Stephens made.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Rothenberg. I don't think we want to spend time at this point talking about the legal standard. I'm just trying to get factual background here.

MS. STEPHENS: Yes.

2.3

THE COURT: Mr. Rothenberg, when you talk about reports and have described to me the process of identifying the responsive reports, are you talking about the same thing as is described in the FHFA letter as project files?

MR. ROTHENBERG: Yes, your Honor. The parties have requested what are known as the daily and final due diligence reports. Those are the reports that Clayton provided to the individual clients on a daily basis during the course of the due diligence review, as well as at the end of the review, those are the final reports. So, those are all of the reports that Clayton provided to any of its clients for any of the reviews at issue.

THE COURT: When you indicate, Mr. Rothenberg, that by the end of November, all you will have left on your current schedule is Nomura, Deutsche Bank, and MorganStanley.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300